

**From:** [Niemi, Cheryl \(ECY\)](#)  
**To:** [Szelag.Matthew@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Szelag.Matthew@epamail.epa.gov)  
**Subject:** FW: Risk Tradeoffs in Fish Consumption  
**Date:** Monday, November 19, 2012 11:47:18 AM  
**Attachments:** [Risk Tradeoffs in Fish Consumption.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Don.Essig@deq.idaho.gov [mailto:Don.Essig@deq.idaho.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 16, 2012 11:57 AM  
**To:** Macchio.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov; kissinger.lon@epa.gov; Niemi, Cheryl (ECY)  
**Subject:** Risk Tradeoffs in Fish Consumption

Interesting article hot off the presses.

Makes the point that mercury fish consumption advisories that are targeted at pregnant women provide quantifiable health benefits in the form of increased IQ of their children that the authors actually monetize as amounting to \$386 million a year. BUT, if these advisories also cause some in the non-target population all of us that are not pregnant women, to eat less fish then health costs associated with cardiovascular disease increase. The authors calculate that if only 0.6% of the population aged 40+ reduced their fish intake by one meal per week the benefits of increased IQ would be completely offset by increased cardiovascular disease.

Although the tradeoffs undoubtedly vary with contaminant I think is relevant to Idaho's consideration of new fish consumption rates on which to base human health criteria as it points out the risks are not one-sided even though that is how we typically calculate them.